

REMARKS

This paper is in response to the Office Action mailed January 26, 2004. By this paper, claims 5-7 and 10 are amended, claims 1-4, 8, 9, 13 and 14 are cancelled without prejudice, and claims 15-21 are added. Accordingly, claims 5-7, 10-12 and 15-21 are pending upon entry of is amendment.

Response to Objection to the Drawings

The drawings currently stand rejected because they fail to include reference numbers identifying the parts of the invention as described in the written description. Applicants submit herewith the attached replacement sheets of formal drawings to replace the original informal drawings. The replacement drawings includes changes in that reference numbers identifying the parts identified in the written description have been added. Applicants submit that no new matter has been added by these amendments.

Amendments to the Written Description

Applicants have amended the written description so that the correct figure number is referenced in the written description. No new matter has been added by these amendments.

Response to Rejection of Claim 6

Claim 6 is directed to a nozzle adapted for mounting on the discharge chute of a walk-behind blower. In centrifugal-type blowers, the air velocity is generally higher in the lower (most distant radial) section of the shroud. This higher velocity air profile at ground level has a tendency to produce eddy currents and turbulence that causes leaves and debris being blown by the blower air stream to spin upward and circle back. The inventive nozzle includes a restriction in an upper portion of the nozzle that increases the velocity of the air in the upper region of the nozzle at the outlet end. This configuration improves lateral displacement of leaves by knocking the leaves down and reducing the amount of leaves that circling back as a result of eddy currents. More particularly, claim 6, as amended, is directed to a nozzle comprising, *inter alia*:

a nozzle body being open at an inlet end and open at an outlet end, said inlet end and said outlet end being in flow communication through a channel formed in said nozzle body, said channel being associated with a first cross-sectional area at said inlet end, and said channel being associated with a second cross-sectional area at said outlet end, wherein said second cross-sectional area is less than said first cross-sectional area, the reduction in cross-sectional area being substantially caused by a change in the shape of the channel in an upper portion of the nozzle body, such that air velocity through an upper region of the channel is greater than the air velocity through a lower region of the channel at the outlet end.

Claim 6 in the application stands rejected as being anticipated by Lauer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,253,416). Claim 6, as amended, is novel and patentable over the references of record, and particularly over Lauer et al., because the cited art does not show or suggest a blower nozzle having a nozzle body that has a change in the shape of the channel in an upper portion of the nozzle body, such that air velocity through an upper region of the channel is greater than the air velocity through a lower region of the channel at the outlet end as required by claim 6.

Lauer et al. discloses a walk-behind blower that has a maneuverable air stream director that can be controlled by the blower operator as the operator pushes the blower along a path of travel. The air stream director may be oscillated up and down to control the direction of the stream of air produced by the blower. As can be clearly seen, the blower nozzle disclosed by Lauer et al. does not have a restriction or a change in channel shape that would cause the air to travel at a higher velocity through the upper region of the channel than the air traveling through the lower region of the channel at the outlet end.

In fact, Lauer et al. teach away from the necessity of such a nozzle. As Lauer et al. illustrate in Figures 12 and 13, the blower allows the operator to rapidly change the vertical angle of the air stream coming from the nozzle to knock down the leaf stack instead of increasing the velocity through the upper region. As illustrated, the operator allows the leaf stack to loft as a result of the eddy currents in the air stream (shown by reference number 153). The operator then moves the nozzle into an upwardly biased position to direct the air stream against the upper portion of the stack to blow the leaves in the lateral direction. ('416 patent, col. 8, line 60-col. 9,

line 26; Figures 9-13). Thus, the reference fails entirely to teach or suggest a nozzle as required by claim 6.

Accordingly, claim 6 is not anticipated by or made obvious by the cited reference and favorable consideration of claim 6 is respectfully requested. Independent claims 5 and 10 contain limitations similar to those of claim 6 and are likewise patentable over the cited art. Claims 7 and 10-12, depending directly or indirectly from one of claims 6 or 10, are submitted as patentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons.

New Claims

Applicants have added new claims directed to subjected matter that Applicants believe is patentable over the cited art. Prompt allowance of the new claims is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the remarks made herein, Applicant submits that the claims presented herein are patentably distinguishable from the art applied and prompt allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner determine that anything else is desirable to place this application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone.

Respectfully Submitted,

WEGMAN, HESSLER & VANDERBURG

By: _____



Jeffrey S. Ellsworth

Reg. No. 51,650

Suite 200

6055 Rockside Woods Boulevard

Cleveland, Ohio 44131

216/642-3342

April 1, 2004